SPEECH

OF

HON. H. WINTER DAVIS, OF MARYLAND,

BEFORE THE ELECTORS OF THE FOURTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF MARYLAND,

At the New Assembly Rooms, Baltimore, September 27, 1860.

———o———

FELLOW CITIZENS OF BALTIMORE: I regret that absence on public duty has prevented my being with you to celebrate the first note of triumph over the dissolution of the Democratic party.

When the resolution of the American members of the Legislature of Maryland, which has just been read to you, was passed, there *was* a Democratic party; one which was an "Old Bruiser," [laughter,] as Mr. Thompson described Great Britain, roaming about the world, thrashing whomsoever it pleased, and shaking its fist in the face of all creation, domineering over everybody, impudent, intolerant, and tyrannical. *Now*, the Democratic party is disputed between the warring elements, headed by Mr. Douglas and by Mr. Breckinridge. Who will have the honor of burying the body, is not for us to determine. That will be left to whichever of these two fragments shall turn out to be the stronger at the end of this contest; and in that way to arrogate to itself to be the sole, united, undivided, universal, national, omnipotent Democratic party. [Laughter.] Our Democratic brethren, last year, at Frederick, passed a resolution, saying that upon the integrity of the Democratic party depended the integrity of the Union. The party is gone—where is the Union? [Laughter.] That where went its fragments, must likewise go the fragments of the Union; and in accordance with the unfulfilled but anxiously desired prophecy, one large portion of that party is now engaged perpetually in prophesying that if *they* happen to be defeated, that result will still follow. Gentlemen, it is matter of profound gratitude in my mind, that whatever else turn up, there is an end of that intolerable domination, [applause]—than which none, *without exception*, can be worse; than which none can be more inimical to the peace, the happiness, the integrity, and the great interests of this country; than which none can ever push this country nearer to the brink of the precipice of disunion; and the death of which confers more strength upon it than the death of *all* other political organizations that have ever existed. [Great applause.]

It is time there should be a change. Maryland has thought so long, and she struggled long and heroically. She struggled under the heroic Scott, and failed. She struggled under the conservative and statesmanlike Fillmore, [great applause,] and failed—failed, not by any fault of hers—failed, because there were "weak knees" elsewhere; because men were afraid to meet the Democratic party on its own ground, and hold it responsible for its own principles. Maryland alone, of all the States, kept her banner floating in the breeze, and stands to this day with her escutcheon more brilliant than any other in the United States, [applause,] for heroic devotion, for unshaken pluck, for perfect resolution to do as she pleases, and leave the rest of the country to do as it pleases. [Applause.] And now, under another leader, equally acceptable, of wider public experience, of old Whig antecedents, holding the most intimate relations to that great statesman to whom Maryland was always only too proud to give her voice; first in every department of the public service, true upon every great question that touches the *real* interests of the country, Maryland places the names of JOHN BELL and EDWARD EVERETT before her people. [Tremendous applause.] And I take it, that deeply as she feels the necessity of a change, just so deeply and firmly is she resolved that for them, in November, her vote shall be cast. [Applause.] Whatever timid men may do elsewhere, whatever coalitionists and fusionists may do elsewhere, whatever doubt and hesitation may drive other people to do, let what will come, the vote of Maryland will, in November, be cast for these two men; and then Maryland will have discharged *her* duty, and her skirts will be free from the responsibility of whatever may occur.

I know, fellow citizens, the deep feeling which pervades you upon the condition of the national Government. I know that you, as I do, think that the most important of all things is a change in the Government; and having come to that conclusion, that it is our duty to do our best to effect that change, in such manner as shall best secure the peace and the happiness of the coun-

try; but that *in no contingency*, under no combination of circumstances, for no purpose, are we to aid, directly or indirectly, in continuing in power those whom we now have a chance of ejecting.

Why is a change so necessary? Is that Democratic party fit to be trusted with the power of the sword, which has allowed innocent and honest American citizens to be shot down in the streets of Washington by American soldiers? ["No, no."] Is it fit to be trusted with the sword, which has converted the army of the United States into a *posse comitatus* to enforce the service of process, and to subject the people of the Territories to military rule? Are they fit to be trusted with the power of the sword, who have wielded it so weakly in Utah, so illegally in Paraguay? Are they fit to be trusted with the power of the sword, who, forgetful of all the obligations of international law, have fired into the neutral vessels in or near the fort of Vera Cruz—an act so flagrantly illegal, that the courts of this country had to discharge the captured vessels as not legal prize? Are they fit to be trusted with the power of the sword, who have sought at the hands of Congress authority to use it, "whenever, in the opinion of the President," American citizens may be injured, or American interests may in his discretion require it, abroad, against any of our South American republican sisters? Are they fit to be intrusted with the sword, who desire the privilege, and have endeavored to get it, of protecting the transit routes, without the authority of Congress given at the particular time, but according to the mere will and humor of the President? Are they fit to be intrusted with the power of the sword, who have recommended to Congress that the President should be allowed, in time of profound peace, without any serious provocation, to take military possession of, and hold for an indefinite time, two great States of the Mexican Republic—Cuihuahua and Sonora? ["No, never."] Why, my friends, we had better at once give the whole power of war to the President. They have forgotten here all the limitations upon the Executive power, and they are grasping at the right to wield the sword, at the pleasure of the President, irrespective of the will of the people, whenever or wherever it may suit his discretion.

Are they fit to be trusted with the direction of the finances and the commercial interests of the country, who, in time of profound peace, have run up a debt of some forty millions of dollars for the ordinary expenses of the Government, rather than vary the tariff to supply its wants; who have swollen its expenses during one year to nearly or over eighty millions of dollars; who thought that the crisis of 1857 was a passing breeze, that ruffled the surface merely of our mercantile transactions—that terrific storm which turned up from its depths the sea of commerce, and left strewn all along the coast of this Republic the fragments of our greatest fortunes?

Are *they* fit to be intrusted with the administration of the Government? Read the Fort Snelling report. Read the Willett's Point report. Read the Covode Committee's report. Read Mr. Sherman's report on the navy yards and their corruptions. Read of the political brokerage for contracts. Read of the distribution among members of Congress of the patronage of the navy yard in Brooklyn, divided up between the Democratic Representatives from the city of New York. Read of the navy yard at Philadelphia made a receptacle of illegal voters to return Democratic members to Congress. Read of the reckless use of public money in the elections. Read of the President himself directing the distribution of the surplus compensation from one of the printing departments, for party purposes among party papers, instead of recommending that the ratio of compensation should be reduced by Congress.

Is any party fit to be intrusted with the Government, which not only thus abuses its powers, but asserts its freedom from Congressional investigation into acts so detrimental to the public service?

Fellow citizens, are these gentlemen fit to be intrusted with the Government of a free Republic, after their conduct in Kansas, where they attempted to force by violence upon the people a Constitution that they utterly repelled and abhorred; then attempted to force through the two Houses of Congress a law to make that Constitution the Constitution *of Kansas*, when its people had utterly repudiated it; and then, when Kansas adopted *another* Constitution, allowed it to lie for months upon the table of Congress, without its having been taken up for action in the Senate? Are they fit to be intrusted with the conduct of the Government, who could so far forget the interests of the great agricultural classes as to allow to be vetoed (after voting against it in the lower House) the Agricultural College bill of Mr. Morrill, of Vermont, which would have given the State of Maryland $150,000 to endow her new Agricultural College? Are they fit to be allowed to take care of the public interests, who prefer to go on borrowing money, day after day, and year after year, rather than remodel the TARIFF, so as to protect all the varied interests of American industry? [Great applause.] Even Mr. Douglas, in his campaign through Pennsylvania, found it essential to make a slight reference to the condition of the revenue laws and the tariff, as a condition precedent to asking a vote in that great State. And yet the Democratic majority in the Senate allowed a tariff bill, passed by an overwhelming vote of the lower House, to lie on their table for weeks and weeks; at any moment of which they could have taken it up and passed it, and thus restored to life and energy all the great material interests of the American Republic. But there it rests, and there it is likely to rest.

Fellow citizens, these are the reasons why we want a change of government. These are the reasons why we want to oust from position those who have abused or neglected properly to exercise the powers of the Government, and to place some gentleman there who will, in these respects at least, restore the Government to its original basis, restore to the commerce of the country the protection of the Federal Government; give us the laws which are essential to the prosperity of

the industry of the country; execute that great and necessary improvement, the Pacific railroad; reinstate the system of improvements of rivers and of harbors throughout the whole country; reorganize and recreate the navy, which has been allowed to rot to pieces under their neglect, [applause;] place the army upon a footing that will enable it to be the nucleus around which the volunteer sons of the Republic may rally in the event of any great public necessity; sweep out from office the flocks of "unclean birds" that have there been nestling for the last eight years, [tremendous applause,] and put in their places men who will *honestly* discharge their duties, men who will honestly *devote their time* to the public interests, men who will cease to strive over the matters which now divide the Democratic party, and will allow the voice of the people, calling on the Government for the protection and aid to their industry which it requires, to be heard and answered.

In my judgment, that never can be, so long as the Democratic party is allowed to remain in power. So long as the Democratic party shall remain in power, so long there will be nothing but one eternal howl on the negro question to keep themselves in. There is no remedy for that old conflict, except turning them out, neck and heels, "to get an airing," as a Virginia friend said; and, I take it, when they are turned out, there will be a rest on that subject.

Now, gentlemen, we, in Maryland, and our true political friends everywhere, are doing what in them lies to give to JOHN BELL the glory of doing this. We make this effort, perhaps, under adverse circumstances. We have encountered adverse circumstances before. We are not to be discouraged by any odds that stand before us. We mean to cast our votes and to get our friends to cast their votes to secure, as far as in us lies, that great result. We trust that the division of the Democratic party may enable us to take great steps towards the accomplishment of that high purpose. We trust that they will be broken down in a great portion, if not in every one, of the Southern States. We trust that the State organizations will be transferred from the hands of the Democratic party to the hands of their opponents, and that again there will be an opportunity to hear the voices of Whig Senators from the South, debating in the Senate, as Mr. Clay and Mr. Berrien debated in former days. [Great applause.]

Fellow citizens, there are before the country four candidates for the Presidency. I wish to call your attention to-night, without indulging in any bitterness towards either gentleman or either party, to the real political opinions of all these four gentlemen, and I beseech your attention. I rise here, this night, not to add bitterness to any controversy. I will join my voice to no portion of any party, the tendency of which is to widen existing diversities, to indurate existing prejudices, to influence existing passions, to mislead the public from the truth in order to gain a political advantage; but, stating everything fairly and fully, I shall leave you to form your own judgment, as to how far different representations are well founded, as to how far a different policy comports with the interests and peace of the Republic, as to how far partisan influences or personal ambition may have tended to mislead gentlemen, or to cause them to mislead the public. I desire to misrepresent nobody; and I shall not hesitate to state whatever can be stated, fairly and freely, to set the opinions of every one of these four gentlemen honestly and truly before you, and then possibly we shall be able to form a judgment of the propriety or impropriety of certain modes of conducting the canvass, which I have observed in the newspapers to have become very common. It has not been my fortune heretofore in this canvass to have the privilege of addressing any of my fellow citizens, here or elsewhere. I have been engaged in arduous public duty assigned to me by those in authority, and I have had no opportunity even to attend a political meeting elsewhere; but I have had my eye upon the current of public affairs. I have had my ear open to the echoes of what has been said elsewhere; and whilst I allow no one to speak for me, either here or elsewhere, [great applause,] and whilst I regard no insinuations from any quarter, ["that's right,"] I likewise am never afraid to say exactly what I think upon public affairs. I am no boy in politics, that I should be afraid to make a declaration of what I think. I am no child of yesterday, that I should be frightened by popular clamor out of telling my constituents what I know to be for their good. I am not eaten up by any personal ambition that would lead me to hide, in any particular, any opinion of mine. [Great applause.] I have met the clamor of Democrats, in their highest rage, in the Hall of Representatives, when I dared to do what other men did not choose to do [vociferous cheering,] and I am not afraid, before you my constituents, to avow that act, and to say that, were it to go over again, I would repeat it. [Renewed cheering.] I am not afraid here, this evening, before my fellow citizens of Baltimore, to say that I do not hesitate now to proclaim before you *all* my opinions with reference to this pending contoversy. If it is supposed that any amount of intimidation, or threat, or in fatuation, can make me say that I am willing to make *any* combination with a Democrat, to aid a Democrat to his election, I tell them they mistake the man. [Great applause.] I will do everything *that is honorable* to elect JOHN BELL; I will do nothing to prevent the defeat of a Democrat by *anybody*. [Renewed applause.] Aid the Democrats! [laughter]—so courteous—so forbearing—so respectful—so considerate of the "Know-Nothing" party! [laughter]—so ready to coalesce with "the enemies of civil and religious liberty!" [laughter]—so ready to shake hands with "bloody midnight assassins!" [laughter]—so content to accept our votes; so unwilling to reciprocate the compliment, as in the great contest of Fuller, Banks, and Richardson, [applause]—so truthful in their representations of my position in that great controversy, and so considerate in their expressions of opinion touching my conduct in the last great con-

troversy! Of course, gentlemen, I am a Christian man, and I *ought* to coalesce with them! [Laughter.] No; they may get along as they can. I see, gentlemen, and you see, everywhere in the newspapers "the wing" of the Democratic party led by Mr. Breckinridge, and "the wing" of the Democratic party led by Mr. Douglas; but there is no "body" of it spoken of anywhere. These "wings" are good for flight, but poor for battle. The claws are not there. The beak is not there. They are powerless—the shadow of what they were. Now, this great Cæsar, in its most miserable estate, shaking with its last ague, cries out,

"——— like a sick girl,
Give me some drink, Titinius!"

[laughter;] but, I take it, there will be some one else who will minister to its thirst in its dying hour than myself or my political friends.

But, gentlemen—to come back to plain matters—let us consider calmly the condition in which we are. Unfortunately, the great body of the Opposition to the Democratic party, which concurs in every principle that I have stated to you, which is in favor of *every* measure that I have indicated as necessary for the public weal, the representatives of which have struggled through long months in Congress, shoulder to shoulder, for the purpose of accomplishing these things, have stood together in exposing the corruptions of the Administration—and in rebuking its high functionaries by votes of the House—that great body of the Opposition, representing the great body of the once powerful and dominant Whig party, is divided, like the Democratic party, from top to bottom; and this is the great misfortune of the times. Whose fault is this? I shall not stop to inquire. Whose misfortune? That of all of us. There are those who seek to widen this division. There are others who know that *no* Opposition Administration can be powerful, enduring, and national, unless it combines both these elements in its support. If Mr. Lincoln shall be President, how can he carry on the Government without the support of the Opposition Representatives from the South, in the Senate and in the lower House? If JOHN BELL shall be President, how can he carry on the Government with only twenty-three members in the House and with two Senators to support him?

Agreeing upon every measure of public policy, agreeing upon almost every vote they will be called upon to pass in either House, touching the great interests of the country, how will it be possible for either of these gentlemen to carry on the Administration, with the friends of the great measures that they both must advocate, to which both are committed, in virtue of having been Old Whigs, as well as in virtue of their present avowals, divided amongst themselves? Will anybody tell me?

I say, then, if there is one thing to be struggled for, more than another, it is the obliteration of the lines of demarcation; it is the bringing together men who think alike upon the great public interests of the country; it is, as far as possible, to push into the background, to silence forever, to put out of men's view, and (if God will only allow it) out of men's thoughts, the *only* element of distraction of a national or party character, which prevents the organization of a great and powerful party, which can hold the Government for a generation, if only the present causes of division can ever be gotten rid of.

There are those who wish to widen the division. My sense of public duty requires me, first of all, to see how wide it is—whether it be a division of principle, too wide to be bridged; or a division occasioned by temporary passions, and susceptible of adjustment, consistently with the honor and interest of every section. And if so, then I am for *that* party really of the Union and of the Constitution—a party united and powerful over the whole Republic—devoted to the interests of the whole country—which will inflict wrong or insult on the sentiments, the feelings, the rights, the interests, of none. And I say, that now, instead of attempting to excite the passions, arouse the hostility, and cast violent imputations upon one great portion of the Opposition now struggling against the Democratic party in the North, it would be wiser not to mislead the people too far, because there may be contingences in which to have misled them may be dangerous. You can easily arouse the passions of men; but when their passions are aroused, it is very difficult to calm them. You can easily excite the fears of men; but when their fears are excited, they are not in a condition for calm conduct. You can very easily lash them into a fury, but then you cannot control them. The representations as to the course of the canvass in certain portions of the United States do, in my judgment, in certain contingencies which are within the bounds of possibility, at least as the end of this political contest, tend to create a state of feeling in the public mind which may prove beyond the control of those who have lashed it into fury. To you, my fellow citizens, to whom I am responsible for my public conduct, and to whom I am bound to tell the whole truth touching the affairs of the country, I desire to say what I think with reference both to the individuals and the parties that are struggling for the supremacy.

Yielding to none in devotion to the interests of the candidate whom my friends support, and whom I shall support—earnestly, and heartily, and resolutely—I am determined here, as I have been resolutely in the House of Congress, never for an instant to allow myself to join in a clamor which I know to be baseless, which I believe to be in a great measure dishonest, and which I am convinced is dangerous to the best interests of the country—[applause]—however certain portions of the Opposition may, for local and temporary purposes, find it to their interest to exaggerate the points of diversity, to keep up the sectional temper, to blacken their political opponents with virulent abuse, to make the people of the South believe that the North is filled with John Browns, to make them believe that the Republicans are not merely a political party, *differing from you as the Democrats differ from each other*, but that they are traitors to the Constitution, hostile to your interests, bent on ser-

vile insurrection, endeavoring to invade your State institutions, and make your families insecure and your lives a torment—that is a policy to which I will never give my assent, and against which I have struggled always. It is a misrepresentation of the condition of affairs in more than one-half of this country, against which I feel called upon, by my highest duty here before you this night, face to face, as I did in the House of Representatives, when responding to the impertinent resolutions of the Maryland Legislature, [great applause,] to declare that they who attempt to excite these passions are doing it for no patriotic purposes. They are doing it to facilitate a party triumph. They are doing it to blacken and render hateful their fellow citizens in the eyes of *their* fellow citizens. They are playing into the hands of that element of disunion which exists at the South, and which rejoices in having the chorus of "disunion if Lincoln is elected" rung all over the South, because, if the contingency should occur, they can appeal to men's pride and their consistency to precipitate them into a revolution.

Now, I say that these representations are *mis*representations of the condition of affairs at the North. What is the great point of diversity? In Congress, after the election of Speaker, there was scarcely a whisper about "John Brown." He had served his purpose, and was dropped. There was scarcely a whisper about "disunion." It would serve no purpose. On the other side, the talk among the men of the Opposition, from the South as well as from the North, was of the corruptions of the Government, of the necessity of a change, of the anxiety of getting somebody who could accomplish that change. *Now*, the tone seems to be different. What are the opinions which prevent their acting together? Not that a man's opinions are at all the criteria by which we are to be guided in voting for him, or refusing to vote for him. If that were the case, we never could elect a President, because there is no one with whom we concur in every particular. We must guide ourselves according *to the policy* we know they are going to pursue; and allow their abstract opinions to remain abstract opinions, unless they are called into active practice, and are matters directly in issue. I say that, at this moment, according to the avowal of every party, *not Democratic*—mark the limitation—according to the avowal of every party, excepting the two wings of the Democratic party, THE SLAVERY QUESTION IS ABSOLUTELY SETTLED, if the Democracy will let it alone. In the language of Mr. Webster, "There is not a foot of territory within the jurisdiction of the United States, the condition of which, as slave or free, is not now irrevocably settled by some law;" and if that be the case, there are some misrepresentations afloat which require to be corrected.

First, gentlemen, what are the opinions of the opposing candidates—Mr. Breckinridge, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Lincoln—upon this great question? Fortunately, the gentleman who prepared the Address of the Union Party, my personal and political friend, Mr. Boteler, of Virginia, than whom there is no sounder Whig, no more chivalrous gentleman, no more earnest friend of JOHN BELL, no more pertinacious, undying enemy of the Democratic party existing, [applause,] has in one portion of that admirable address used these words: "The more conservative portion of the Republican party have tacitly acquiesced in the fugitive slave law, in the existence of slavery in the District of Columbia, and in the right to carry slaves from one State to another." That indicates that the whole of that wide field is covered and out of controversy. You are safe, then, at home. You are safe in carrying, if you choose to carry, your slaves to Mississippi, to sell them. You are safe from the example of freedom in the District of Columbia. There is nothing of that kind open at all. When he said they had "acquiesced in the fugitive slave law," he did not state it strongly enough, because the statements are, from Mr. Corwin last winter in the House, and others, Mr. Lincoln himself included, that it must be executed, "not grudgingly, but fully and honestly." [Applause.] Does anybody take the trouble to repeat these sentiments when talking about politics before the people of Maryland? Then my friend Mr. Boteler proceeds in another sentence to say this:

"At this moment no one will question the correctness of the statement that there is not a foot of the territory of the United States, the condition of which in reference to slavery is not already fixed by law, and there is no place within the Federal domain upon which the abstract theories of the extremists of either section, in regard to the exclusion of slavery from the Territories or its introduction into them, can be practically applied."

That is what I have been saying before you, people of the fourth Congressional district, for five long years, and there *is* no question now open except such as the Democrats may see fit to open, that the way to settle the slavery question is to be silent on it; and it is greatly to be regretted, it is with me a matter of profound regret, that my friend Mr. Boteler in the residue of that document should have allowed himself to go into a discussion as to the responsibilities for the opening of the question, and to lay it perhaps at certain doors where it was not altogether justly due. But taking this starting point, that it is a question of abstractions, that there is no Territory to which mere theories are required to be applied, does not that at once end the whole matter? Is it not of itself an absolute confession that there is no ground for the imputation upon the people of the North in general, that there is no ground for fear in the event of Mr. Lincoln's succeeding in lieu of Mr. BELL, that there is no fear of a dissolution of the Union by reason of anything these gentlemen may do if they happen to get possession of the Government? Is not that distinctly the confession of that statement, that in reference to the substantial questions I have indicated there is an absolute concurrence, and in reference to the others in the Territories they are questions of abstractions? I could not have my own opinion more felicitously, more accurately, or from a more authoritative source, stated for the information of my constituents and of the country.

Now, what are the individual opinions of the gentlemen who are before the country for the

votes of the people? First, for Mr. Breckinridge. We all know that he is the seceding candidate of the Democratic party. We all know that his friends seceded because of an inability to agree upon the slavery question. We find him and Mr. Douglas equally the victims of that element of distraction with which they first broke up the Whig party, then severed and broke up the American party, and to which they have themselves by a righteous judgment at last fallen victims. [Applause.] What are Mr. Breckinridge's opinions? The most extreme, untenable, and dangerous of all; yet people, half of them, are afraid to controvert them. He maintains that the Constitution of itself carries slavery into all the Territories; that under it any individual has a right to carry his slave there *without any law;* and that laws must be passed by Congress, as they may become needful, for the purpose of protecting it. The result, therefore, of the election of Mr. Breckinridge is, that there will be a perpetual struggle in the Congress of the United States, by persons who desire to carry negroes into the Territories, and do not wish to do so until they are protected by law, to secure the passage of laws by Congress to protect them there. There is not the remotest probability that such a law can ever be passed through both Houses of Congress. It is therefore, in its very statement, an element of perpetual discord, of perpetual strife, of perpetual alienation, perpetually tending to widen still further apart the two portions of the Union, until possibly on some great day a dissolution *may* follow, in the heated state of the public mind under some casualty of the moment.

What are Mr. Douglas's opinions? They have been variously stated by himself in his wide circuit through the country; yet I take it that, for this purpose, there cannot be any great difficulty in describing them with accuracy. I desire to do him no injustice; I desire to do Mr. Breckinridge no injustice. I merely wish to inform my constituents what are the things which politicians try to conceal. Mr. Douglas has shown, with great emphasis and great point latterly, in a speech, that the Constitution does *not* carry slavery into the Territories. Of course, it would be beyond the control of the people of a Territory, exactly as any provision of the Constitution applicable to a State is beyond the control of the people of the State; but Mr. Douglas's opinion is, that the inhabitants of a Territory have themselves the absolute right to introduce and allow slavery if they see fit, or to prohibit and exclude it if they see fit. Whether they have this power, by reason of some inherent right, or by reason of the acts of Congress organizing the Territories, his language is doubtful; sometimes he seems to say one thing, and sometimes the other. At any rate, he contends that they may pass what law they please in reference to slavery, and may make their domestic institutions to suit themselves.

The great struggle in the Democratic party, and that on which it has gone to pieces in the great storm, is, which of these two opinions is the orthodox doctrine of the party. Now, whilst I am very unwilling to undertake to decide questions of party history or of party law for the Democrats, I rather fear that my friend, Mr. Douglas, has the better of his antagonist as a question of political history. I rather fear that he is not merely the regular nominee of the Democratic party, but that he likewise is the representative of the regular Democratic opinion. I rather think that if there has been a change, the change has been *from* him, and not *by* him from his companions. I rather think that in his great speech in the Senate towards the end of the last session he arranged an amount of authority which ought to have satisfied, or at least tended strongly to satisfy my mind, and probably satisfied a good many others, that under the ambiguous phrase "non-intervention" was couched the very dogma that he himself proclaimed. And certainly it looked as if he rather had his enemies on the hip when he quoted the language of the Kansas-Nebraska act, "it being the true intent and meaning of this act not to legislate slavery into any Territory, nor to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States." I take it that these words will scarcely bear any other interpretation than that the people of a Territory, before they become a State, have a right, according to the views of the gentlemen who drew and passed that act, to introduce or exclude slavery. I rather think that he had the "old public functiona y" on the hip when he went further, and quoted from his letter of 1856, in which he said that the people of a Territory, like the people of a State, had a right to regulate the question of slavery for themselves.

Whatever may be the truth between those two divisions of the Democratic party, I do not desire to cast any more confusion into their midst than is there now. [Laughter.] I do not know how they will ever be able to solve the great problem as to what are their opinions, unless they shall bring an action in the United States court on a wager, and carry it to the Supreme Court, and have it there decided. [Laughter.] Or if the spoils should ever be divided again, there should be a suit brought in equity, to determine which of the two portions is the real seceder, and which is entitled to the whole of the property. [Laughter.] That is a problem that I do not mean to touch; it is a controversy in which I have no interest; the further and bitterer it is waged, the better probably for the country. But there is at least one good and patriotic thing that Judge Douglas has done in his life. Having lent himself to the extreme Southern portion of his party, to do their work, when his turn came they would not lend themselves to him; they thought they had been dealing with a tool, and they found they had been dealing with a master, and they determined to break him; and he reciprocated the compliment by breaking up the Democratic party. [Applause.]

There is another good thing that he has done. The doctrine of Mr. Breckinridge to which I have referred, it is claimed, rests upon the decision of the Supreme Court in the Dred Scott case; al-

though Mr. Reverdy Johnson, who argued that case, said that really the Supreme Court never passed upon any such question; and it is difficult for any one who knows anything about the legal points really involved in the record before the court to surmise how it was possible for them even to have gotten at it; yet this theory, bolstered up by the perpetual assertions of political men, has been adopted by the great body of the Democratic party at the South, and some of our friends are gradually gliding into it, until I suppose it will come after a while to be a great piece of treason to the South, a great invasion of Southern rights, something dangerous to her internal condition, to venture to moot a quest on which is only ten years old, and to say that you do not believe in any such legal absurdity as that the Constitution (which says nothing about slavery in the Territories) has extended it to the Territories—an opinion as absurd as that Congress cannot establish slavery in a Territory if it see fit.

The Democratic party has lived upon its boasted orthodoxy for the last twenty years. It has been "out at the elbows" in everything else; its reputation is all gone, for everything except impudence and audacity; but by holding itself out as the special protector of Southern institutions, it has been enabled to stand upon its legs. It has asserted its own exclusive orthodoxy, always putting up the most extreme and untenable pretensions, and always smearing everybody else over with the brush of abolitionism, who did not see fit to agree with it. Did anybody happen to quote the resolutions of the Legislature of Ohio, or the nice family quarrel between the Hards and Softs of New York, or any other of the wranglings and diversities in the free States, over this "hard doctrine and difficult to be received" by Northern men, he was told, "You must not pretend to discuss differences in the Democratic party; it is one and indivisible." [Laughter.] But Judge Douglas has done this patriotic service: he has carried from Maryland to Louisiana, through every slave State, the elements of division upon that new dogma; and when it is attempted to assail others for expressing their opinions on the slavery question, who avow that they hold, as I avow that I hold, all the opinions of Henry Clay, [applause]—a little out of fashion in divers particulars in this day, but I am getting to be old-fashioned—they cannot turn and say, "You are an abolitionist, and the united Democratic party is the only one that is faithful to the South;" because, in every neighborhood, in every town, in every parish, in every county, rise up the friends of Stephen A. Douglas, and say, "The Constitution does *not* carry slavery into the Territories, but the people have a right to exclude it if they choose." [Applause.] It is no longer treason to say that, for their own men say it; and now, in the Commonwealth of Virginia, the Breckinridge men are on their knees to the Douglas men, and say, "Oh, don't divide, and give the State to Bell." [Laughter.] The Governor of the State, holding all the powers of the State, the man who must call out the Virginia militia "to arrest the march of United States troops, in case of a rebellion further South," is tainted with the heresy of Douglasism. [Laughter.] They have ceased to be powerful; they have ceased to be dangerous; there is again freedom of opinion; men can speak above their breath; men can read history, and repeat it, without the fear of being tarred and feathered, in any neighborhood in the South. [Applause.] If Mr. Douglas shall never do anything more than that, if he shall fail to be elevated at any future period to that glittering height which is the object of his ambition, I desire to say that future generations will owe him a debt of gratitude for having, in the course of the internecine struggles of the Democratic party, and perhaps without meaning it, but from the necessities of the case, been instrumental in restoring free speech, free opinion, and a right to think as the fathers thought upon the Constitution of the United States, though he does not happen to think with them. [Applause.]

Now, what are Mr. BELL's opinions on these subjects? He avows, like an honest man, his opinions, and they substantially concur as a matter of abstract opinion with those of Mr. Breckinridge. That is, he thinks that, without a law of Congress, under the Constitution there is a right to take slaves into the Territories; but he differs from Mr. Breckinridge in this: that he has been nominated by a party calling itself the Constitutional Union party, and that party proclaims itself, in its address from which I have read to you, an enemy of slavery agitation, in favor of things remaining as they are, opposed to any further legislation, for the doctrine that I have so often inculcated in your hearing, of silence upon the negro question. Let it die the death; let the Territories remain as they are; let there be no effort to change their condition, and there can be no controversy. That is a position which a gentleman holding any abstract opinion whatever may very well come up to, and that is the opinion which the brief and pointed platform of the Constitutional Union party assigns to both its candidates, wholly independent of what their individual opinions may be. They are what Mr. Boteler in his address most appropriately terms mere abstractions, abstract opinions that are not required to be acted on at this time, and can only be called into living existence by an attempt to put them in practice, and change the existing condition of the Territories; and if I understand the opinion of all the gentlemen who, with myself, advocate the election of Mr. BELL, it is, that he may silence that controversy, and not reopen it; leave things as they are, and not attempt to vary them. If that be not the view with which he was nominated, if that be not the purpose of his friends, then it will be the most pitiable farce, and I should be the last man in the world to ask any one here to vote for JOHN BELL as a person who was going to quiet the slavery question. It cannot be quieted, as long as there is an effort to change anything, for that raises the question. When anybody proposes that anything in the Territories, no matter what it may be, no matter for whom it may operate, or against whom it may operate, should be otherwise than it is, that instant he opens the con-

troversy; and when the controversy is opened, no one knows where or how it will be ended.

Next, with reference to Mr. EVERETT. He holds, or did hold in former days, opinions upon exactly the other extreme. You remember that Mr. Fillmore was impeached of Abolitionism, because, at a former time, when a candidate for Congress, he had declared himself in favor of the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia; and yet, in spite of that, because men knew what his policy would be, the people elected him Vice President; and all the people rose up to do him honor when he passed out from the discharge of the duties of his high office. That is only another illustration of how false a guide mere abstract constitutional opinions are, when you are selecting a President. The question is, never what he may *think* as a question of law, but what he will *do* as an administrator of the law. [Applause.]. There cannot be a more striking example of that than in the case of Mr. EVERETT, one of the most distinguished, patriotic, conservative, and moderate men in the United States, perfectly orthodox in his old Whig policy and principles, having filled some of the high stations of the nation, and now not, perhaps, without a prospect of filling the highest itself. That gentleman was sent many years ago, I think by General Harrison, as Minister to England. It appeared, as well as I remember the circumstances, that he had previously been a candidate for some office in Massachusetts, and there he had questions thrust at him, to which, in the heat of the canvass, he responded, and it seemed that he avowed himself in favor of abolishing the slave trade between the States, of the immediate abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, and against the admission of any more slave States. Now-a-days, people would open their eyes with horror at the mere mention of opinions like these; and in that day they wanted to injure that great and distinguished man because he entertained these opinions, and the action of the Georgia Legislature was invoked because Mr. Berrien had voted for his confirmation. Now, EDWARD EVERETT is the candidate of the Constitutional Union party, for the purpose of stopping agitation on the slavery question, [applause,] and in my judgment they could have got no fitter candidate in the United States. [Great applause.]

I say that a man's abstract opinions have little or nothing to do with his discharge of the high functions of either President or Vice President; and when they are invoked by political partisans, they are invoked to distract the timid, to divide their opponents, to draw off votes, to enable themselves to elect some person of less position, without expressed opinions, by the prejudices that they excite, by quotations of antiquated opinions, or opinions intended for another era, applicable to a different combination of circumstances, having no relation to those things that are now to be done, and therefore impertinences, so far as the political canvass is concerned. Are we to be prevented from voting for Mr. EVERETT, because some Democratic orator down in the slaveholding counties may rake up that question and the response, and say, "you are voting for an Abolitionist?" I have seen the day when men who were Whigs were fools enough to be frightened at that howl. I take it that now they have learned that it is merely a howl, and nothing else, and they treat it accordingly. [Applause.]

Both Mr. EVERETT and Mr. BELL, by virtue of the simple declaration that they are in favor of the Constitution, the Union, and the enforcement of the laws, have pledged themselves to silence, to quiet, to leaving things as they are, to the faithful and honest execution of every law, and from such men in these days that is ample. It is impossible to go back into the history of any man who has filled public station in this country for twenty years, and not find that in the sharp struggles of parties here he has uttered an obnoxious sentiment, that there he has been guilty of an imprudent or unpopular vote, that here he has answered a question thrust at him in the heat of a canvass, which, pushed to its logical consequences, would involve a great error. If you allow yourselves to be misled by that style of canvassing, you will strip the country of the services of nine out of every ten of its best men, confine it to people who have been so insignificant that they have never been called upon to make a declaration upon any great controverted question; who have all the time been skulking along, endeavoring to get upon the popular side for the time being, eschewing pen, ink, paper, and printing, as if they were the inventions of Mephistophiles, and trusting by their very insignificance to worm themselves up into high station, as I have seen divers in these latter days, even to the Presidential chair. It is this sheer cowardice, this fear to take gentlemen upon their course and conduct, and not upon their expressions and their abstract opinions, that has driven great men from the Presidential chair. It is because gentlemen are afraid of being turned out of Congress, are afraid of going before their constituents, and being hissed for making the avowal of obnoxious opinions, that you have weak men in public life, and the race of great men has gone to the grave. [Applause.]

Well, now, what are the opinions of Mr. Lincoln? Let us meet the question right in the eye: What are the opinions of Mr. Lincoln, because there are certain parties in this country who say that if he is elected they will dissolve the Union. I do not assert that all Mr. Breckinridge's friends say so. I believe that the vast majority of them have no such idea. I believe that very many of them who say so would not attempt it when the time came. [Laughter.] I believe in the "sober second thought." I believe that the difficulties of the practical execution, that horror at shedding fraternal blood, would make the boldest pause. I do not fear the result. I am confident that Mr. Breckinridge himself entertains no such policy. I am not here to misrepresent any political antagonist. I am not here to sow dissensions between any regions of the country. I merely say that there are parties who declare that that event will be cause

for a dissolution of the Union; and that declaration on their part is made the pretext of an echo, from other quarters, that if Lincoln be elected, such will be the result. Now, I say that will not be the result, and in my judgment it will not be tried; but since it is said that in that event they are going to take steps at least to break up the Confederacy, let us see upon what ground they are going to do it.

Mr. Botcler says, in his address, in the most authoritative manner, that on the really great questions, among the conservative portions of the Republican party, there is an acquiescence in what we suppose to be essential to our safety—the right of slave trade between the States, the right to continue slavery in the District of Columbia, and the execution of the fugitive slave law. What else is open? Nothing, literally nothing, excepting the mere condition of the Territories. Then, what now is the condition of the Territories? Absolutely free in point of fact; no slave in them, remaining as they were at the time of the repeal of the Missouri compromise—in spite of that repeal, remaining as free from slavery as if that compromise had never been repealed. What is there, then, to change? From the extremest point of view, nothing. It is only with reference to the question of slavery in the Territories that we are told, by the address from the National Committee of the Union party, that there is a controversy open, and as to them it is said that the controversy is a controversy of abstractions. But it can be stated stronger than that. So far as the opinions of Mr. Lincoln and his friends go, the Territories are in the exact condition in which they want to keep them. They say, "let the subject alone, and they have nothing to say; if you attempt to carry slavery there, we will attempt to exclude it; if you attempt to extend it, we will oppose the extension; if you attempt to plant slavery in territory which we think is now free, we not only will not vote with you, but we will vote against you, and we will use the power of the Government for the purpose of keeping it where it is." It is not necessary, even if it was their design, now to propose the passage of any law on the subject of slavery at all. The Territories are practically in the exact condition that they were when Mr. Clay introduced his great compromise bill, which was the foundation of peace until the controversy was reopened by the Democrats in 1854. The condition of the Territories remains as it was when Mr. Clay had his bills passed, saying not one word on the subject of slavery, but resting on his resolutions. What were his resolutions? The second of the resolutions which Mr. Clay brought into the Senate on the great occasion in 1850, runs in this wise—I pray you, gentlemen, be not shocked, because I told you that Mr. Clay held some old-fashioned notions, but this resolution was the foundation of the legislation of that day; it was attacked by the extreme Southern men in the Senate, it was denounced as being no compromise at all; but it was the view on which great men, such as Mr. Benton on one side, and Mr. Clay and Mr. Webster on the other side, concurred for the settlement of the Territorial difficulties, and therefore it bears a historic significance even beyond the vast authority of the name of the man who reported it. It runs in this wise:

"That as slavery does not exist by law, and is not likely to be introduced into any territory acquired by the United States from the Republic of Mexico, it is inexpedient for Congress to provide by law either for its introduction or exclusion from any part of said territory."

Silence upon the slavery question, leaving the Territory as it was, and nothing more, was the great wisdom of that compromise. [Applause.] Here you see what Mr. Clay thought. He thought slavery did not exist there, because the laws of Mexico excluded it. The Missouri compromise of 1820 excluded it from all the residue of the Territory. It was on that basis, coupled with the unfitness of the country for slave labor even if the laws did not exclude it, that Mr. Webster made the great declaration that there was an irrepealable law, of one kind or another, which forever settled the condition as to slavery of every foot of territory in the United States.

Now, gentlemen, what Abraham Lincoln thinks is what Mr. Clay thought with reference to slavery and the condition of the Territory—that it is free. It is therefore needless to pass any law upon the subject. He thinks it is time, and so do a great many others who bear Mr. Clay's memory in high esteem—not with Mr. Douglas, that a bunch of squatters, congregated under a bush, can pass a law to determine the condition of the Territory for you and me—but that the great National Legislature, which under the Constitution has the power "to make all needful rules and regulations concerning the Territory," has the power, if it see fit, to exclude or to admit slavery in any Territory, and that, in the absence of a statute, there is no law to authorize it; and then slavery can no more exist than a man can exist without air to breathe. Here is the language of Mr. Clay upon that subject—that it is an evil, and ought not to be extended voluntarily:

"I am extremely sorry to hear the Senator from Mississippi say that he requires first the extension of the Missouri compromise line to the Pacific, and also that he is not satisfied with that, but requires, if I understood him correctly, a positive provision for the admission of slavery south of that line. And now, sir, coming from a slave State, as I do, I owe it to myself, I owe it to truth, I owe it to the subject, to state, that no earthly power could induce me to vote for a specific measure for the introduction of slavery where it had not before existed, either south or north of that line. Coming as I do from a slave State, it is my solemn, deliberate, and well-matured determination, that no power—no earthly power—shall compel me to vote for the positive introduction of slavery, either south or north of that line. Sir, while you reproach, and justly too, our British ancestors for the introduction of this institution upon the continent of America, I am, for one, unwilling that the posterity of the present inhabitants of California and New Mexico shall reproach us for doing just what we reproach Great Britain for doing to us. If the citizens of those Territories choose to establish slavery, I am for admitting them with such provisions in their Constitution; but then, it will be their own work, and not ours, and their posterity will have to reproach them, and not us, for forming Constitutions allowing the institution of slavery to exist among them. These are my views, sir, and I choose to express them; and I care not how extensively and universally they are known. The honorable Senator from Virginia has expressed his opinion that slavery exists in these Territories, and I have no doubt that opinion is sincerely and honestly entertained by him; and I would say with equal sincerity and honesty, that I believe that *Slavery nowhere exists within any portion of the territory acquired by*

us from Mexico. He holds a directly contrary opinion to mine, as he has a perfect right to do; and we will not quarrel about that difference of opinion."

Then, again, touching the power:

"The power then, Mr. President—and I extend it to the introduction as well as to the prohibition of slavery in the new Territories—does exist with Congress. I think it is a power adequate either to introduce or exclude slavery. I admit the argument in both its forms of application."

Judged by the standard of Henry Clay, the opinion of Mr. Lincoln, together with the opinion of all the great men of the North, excepting, possibly, a few Democrats, for aught I know to the contrary, is, that slavery is an evil which they are unwilling to extend, and that the power of exclusion exists, leaving open the question of the necessity or expediency of exercising it. Now, what with reference to the expediency of exercising it? The opinion is expressed, as distinctly as can be, that since slavery does not, in point of fact, exist in the Territories, and since they think it can only exist by affirmative legislation, they have no legislation to ask, unless legislation is asked on the other side; and hence that great declaration of Mr. Sherman, when he was candidate for Speaker in the House of Representatives, in the face of the storm of vilification and abuse with which he was assailed by the Democrats during the whole of that long controversy—a declaration which gentlemen may not be willing to repeat, but which it behooves every man who wishes to know the truth of the history of the country to bear in his mind and ponder—in substance, if not in the words, was, "I tell gentlemen now here, that there is not one subject of sectional controversy which can possibly arise, unless it is thrust on us by our opponents." That was said when he was the candidate of the Republican party for Speaker of the House of Representatives. It was said in the face of the Republicans who were voting for him. It was a sentiment that I knew he had entertained, ever since I had the honor of sitting in the House with him. It might have been thought of some persons a rash declaration for a man in the doubtful and ticklish condition of a candidate for Speaker, within three or four votes of an election, and therefore the more manly, and also the more significant. It was received in silence by his party, and he received again and again their votes for that position.

Does that look like reopening the slavery question? Everybody who knows anything about the history of the country must know, that from the first day of the repeal of the Missouri compromise down to this time, whatever of excitement there has been in the country, and especially in the North, however much of exaggerated sentiment there may have been uttered, however furious the onslaughts of their newspapers and speakers on the South and its institutions—never more violent, never more excited, never more outrageous than the retorts and retaliations of Southern Democrats upon them—judging by the record, (the only way to judge of the purposes of political parties,) there never has been an act attempted that looked beyond reinstating things as they were prior to the repeal of the Missouri compromise. There were measures which I thought were unwise; there were some which I thought were imprudent; they were all, I thought, unnecessary, because I knew they never could become laws, even if ill results would not have followed from them, if they had become laws; because the fixed Democratic majority in the Senate prevented their enactment; but the scope of these proposed laws was confined to the reinstatement of things as they were before the repeal of the Missouri compromise. The controversy has raged about the Territory of Kansas. The struggle has been on the part of the Administration, in Democratic hands, to force slavery into it, against the will of the people. The struggle on the part of the whole body of the Northern people has been to prevent slavery from being forced into Kansas. Nobody can doubt that that is an extension of slavery. Nobody can doubt that that is carrying slavery where it has not heretofore existed. Nobody can doubt, therefore, that it is within the position that leading Northern gentlemen, Mr. Lincoln among them, take with reference to slavery, and especially the opinion of that great man, Mr. Edward Bates, that they are opposed to its extension, to its going where it is not now, and that is all.

I happen to have been a party to all this controversy, sometimes voting in a manner that did not satisfy some of my friends, and sometimes, perhaps, voting in a manner that did not altogether satisfy me on cooler reflection, subsequently; at all times, however, struggling to do what I thought was best under the circumstances, and with the little power that I had. But I was at least a witness of them; I saw what passed; I heard the argument; I think I remember the history. Turn to the journals of Congress, and you will find, I think, that that controversy sums itself up in these several points:

The first bill was a bill to repeal the laws of Kansas passed by the Legislature whose legality was contested. You remember that it was supposed—nay, asserted and proved, there is no supposition about it now; everybody admits it and everybody knows it, since the great investigation ordered by the first Congress in which I was by your votes—that that Legislature was elected by Missourians and others out of the Territory of Kansas. A bill was introduced to repeal the laws of that Legislature, forced on the people by non-residents of the Territory. Was that agitating the slavery question? The next was a bill introduced by my friend, Mr. Dunn, now deceased, reorganizing the Territory of Kansas, reinstating the Missouri compromise, and providing that any slaves which might be there might be removed within one or two years after the passage of the bill; which bill was met by the Democrats in the North with an attack upon the Republicans for establishing slavery in the Territory, and more than one member of Congress lost his election by reason of that Democratic argument. That, you see, merely went to reinstating the Missouri compromise line. The third was the bill to admit Kansas under the Topeka Constitution. That failed; but it was

only to make it a free State. It was an unwise bill, a bill that ought not to have become a law, because there was a mere handful of people in the Territory; but it did nothing so bad as what the Democrats tried to do the next year, when they framed the Lecompton Constitution by a minority of the people, and attempted to force that on the people of Kansas. The next bill was to abolish the existing laws, and to reorganize the Territory of Kansas without one word relating to slavery in any way. In other words, as the contest progressed, the hot blood cooled, and the whole body of the Northern Representatives began to see that all they wanted was to wipe out the Territorial laws, leaving the Territory to the people, and they stopped there in that bill.

The only other controversy that arose was in reference to the Lecompton Constitution. The Democratic party had again taken the lead in forcing a slave Constitution upon the people against their will, and I, together with other Southern Representatives, Mr. Marshall, (now supporting Mr. Breckinridge,) Mr. Gilmer of North Carolina, Mr. Underwood of Kentucky, Mr. Harris of Maryland, [applause,] and one or two others, concurred in defeating it, under the lead of Mr. Crittenden. I take it that it was not agitating the slavery question. If it was, it was agitating it in very strange company, and under very singular auspices.

Now, gentlemen, the statement I have just made covers the history of the controversy in Congress, since I went there, up to the beginning of the last session, on the subject of the Territories. The wild platform adopted at Philadelphia in 1856 said, "it is both the right and duty of Congress to prohibit in the Territories those twin relics of barbarism, polygamy and slavery." At Chicago (to show what men do when they become cool) all that resolution is wholly left out, and there is in it no declaration of a duty to pass any law at this time on the subject. They declare the condition of the Territories to be free in their opinion, in the absence of any law on the subject, just as Mr. Breckinridge declares them to be slave in the absence of a law on the subject. But they proposed no action on the subject, and they repealed and omitted that resolution which was in the platform of 1856. If anything more significant could be required, it is that in the three or four or five bills which were introduced during the last session by Mr. Grow, of Pennsylvania—in all conscience, a stiff free-soiler enough for anybody—as chairman of the Committee on Territories, to organize certain new Territories, there was simply a declaration, in the precise spirit of the resolution which I have read as reported by Mr. Clay, that nothing in these bills, which were absolutely silent on the subject, should be taken to authorize slavery in the Territories—a simple declaration of opinion, needless, in my judgment imprudent, because liable to be distorted and misrepresented; but not at all amounting to a law of affirmative exclusion, but leaving the law as it stood at the time of the passage of the bills.

Well, gentlemen, how are you to judge of the purposes of a party? By hunting up the speeches of small men who want to carry a neighborhood vote? By extracts from furious editors of small papers, who think they are never safe unless they are beyond the most extreme in their neighborhood? Are we to judge of men's opinions by the imputations of their enemies and their exaggerations for a purpose? Are we to suppose that our friends are black because their enemies daub them black? Or are we not rather to look at the facts, and to remember that among the millions of the North there are men as wise as we are, as honest as we are, as well educated as we are, having as great interests at stake in the perpetuity of the Union as we have and as earnestly and honestly devoted to the integrity of the Constitution as we are, and that they are not likely deliberately to invite civil war, deliberately to moot questions which are wholly needless, whatever their opinions may be on them. Let us at least give them credit for common sense, and take their declarations rather than the declarations of their enemies and of our enemies. Is a Democrat's impeachment evidence against anybody on a question of politics? [Laughter, and cries of "No, no"] Now, we all know that there are men who are furious at the South on the negro question, and there are men at the North who are furious on the negro question. I am thankful that they are in an equally small minority in both sections. Their power is clamor. I do not believe that between them they could set a regiment in the field, even if they desired to do so.

And, gentlemen, if a collateral proof was required, of how far the conservative masses of the North, the conservative leaders of the Republican party, or, rather, of the whole body of the Opposition in the North to the Democratic party, are misrepresented, there would be no better or more convincing proof than in the fact that whilst the whole body of the Republican party are denounced as Abolitionists, the Abolitionists themselves have very quietly refused their support, and are organizing separate tickets for themselves. [Laughter and applause.] Can Mr. Breckinridge's friends say as much of the disunionists? Why are not the Abolitionists satisfied with the representations of our Southern brethren? They cannot want anything more than to invade the South; they cannot want anything more than to disturb our firesides; they cannot want anything more than to break up the slave trade between the States; they cannot want anything more than scenes of blood and destruction throughout the country; they cannot want anything more than to repeat John Brown's crazy and bloody exploit by the thousand times a year. That is what we are taught by leading orators of the Democrats to expect, if not the result of a set purpose, the tendency of the conduct of the conservative millions of the North. And that, in the face of the fact that, great as was the storm raised by that insanity of John Brown, and reckless as were the imputations upon gentlemen of certain political opinions throughout the whole North, yet, with all the powers of the United States to rake evidence from one end of the country to the other, with a

diligent examination, extending through months, by the Senate of the United States, by an able and honorable committee, headed by Mr. Mason of Virginia, and after a careful examination by the Legislature of Virginia, there was no evidence found that implicated any body of confederates, or any man holding political position, or aspiring to hold any position, anywhere in the North, with that insane performance. It is, as I have said before, instead of being a source of disquietude, the most quieting of all the occurrences of the last half century. It has lifted the veil of misrepresentation, and enabled us to see what men are doing. Till that event occurred, and till these investigations were had, such was the uniformity of the imputation of extreme anti-slavery opinions to a great body of men at the North, and of an earnest determination to intermeddle with Southern institutions to their damage, that gentlemen, even of calm minds, were perhaps justified in having a doubt, or even perhaps in forming opinions adverse to them upon the subject. But when investigations were made, after that occurrence, subsequent to all the provocations, all the series of outrages in Kansas Territory, where Northern men were allowed to be hunted down by the hundred, during, I believe, more than a year, for the express purpose of extending slavery into it, by border ruffians—notwithstanding all that excitement, nobody could be found implicated, except those at Harper's Ferry, directly with Brown, and one or two accomplices, who had fled. No man of name, not even any of the leading Abolitionists at the North, was found concerned in it. Why, it is, as a general thing, true, that the Abolitionists of the North, so far from exciting rebellion, are of the Quakers' opinion, that it is wrong to shed blood, and are the most peaceable and quiet, if the silliest and most misled, of people in the world. [Laughter.]

Gentlemen, I have stated what I believe to be the condition of affairs at the North. If, with these views of Mr. Lincoln and his leading friends, they should succeed in reaching power, my opinion is that they will act upon these opinions; and unless the question is forced on them by being raised by Democratic agitation, they will let it rest where it is, because they have nothing to accomplish, and there is no reason why they should reopen the question, and they declare that their only purpose is to oppose the extension of slavery into territory now free; or in the words of Mr. Bates—who is entitled to speak for them—in enumerating the opinions of Mr. Lincoln, his personal and political friend, "his opinions are, that slavery is an institution in the States, of the States which choose to have it, and it exists within these States beyond the control of Congress; that Congress has supreme legislative power over all the Territories, and may at its discretion allow or forbid the existence of slavery within them; that Congress in wisdom and sound policy ought not so to exercise its power, directly or indirectly, as to *plant and establish* slavery in any Territory theretofore free, and that it is unwise and impolitic in the Government of the United States to acquire tropical regions for the mere purpose of converting them into slave States."

Then, gentlemen, over all the present Territories of the United States, unless Democrats agitate to extend slavery in fact, it is settled, according to the confessions of the Union party, according to the confession of everybody, excepting Mr. Douglas upon one side and Mr. Breckinridge upon the other. Who is in favor of acquiring more territory to reopen the question? I am not. Are you? ["No, no."] Is JOHN BELL? Is EDWARD EVERETT? Is Mr. Lincoln? Not one of them. Which is the party that does not frown on the filibusters; or, if not quite that, what party claims to be the party of expansion; what party proposed to buy Cuba, at an expense of $300,000,000—a small item of $18,000,000 interest per annum, to be saddled on you and me? Who proposed to take military possession of Sonora and Chihuahua, which, if once gotten, would never be given up? Who was negotiating a treaty which virtually inaugurated a protectorate over Mexico, which must sooner or later resolve itself into a conquest and annexation? Not those opposed to the Democratic party.

The Democratic leaders are the persons who alone propose to acquire additional territory. If they do acquire it, they must take the responsibility of the agitation that will arise out of it. That it will be fierce, is certain; that it can be settled, is uncertain. That the acquisition can be prevented, and ought to be prevented, is of all things the most clear. If great international necessities should force upon us, contrary to our will, additional territory, I take it that, irrespective of the abstract opinions of this party or that, it will be apt to settle itself according to the existing condition of the territory when it is acquired. I doubt very much, if you were to acquire the *Tierra Caliente* of Mexico to-morrow, with the Mexican population densely filling it, slavery could ever be carried there; for it could only be carried there by consent of the people, if at all; and the Mexicans, having abolished it once, would not be likely to reinstate it. On the other hand, if you acquired Cuba, with its immense negro population, no amount of opposition could prevent its admission into the Union with its slaves, as it stood. When acquired, in other words, the law of settlement would be the statesman's law applied by Mr. Clay to the territory acquired from Mexico—the *status quo*, the condition in which it is when acquired. If it is free, it is impossible in this country ever to make it slave, for the whole body of the Northern vote is irrevocably committed against it. If it is slave, the body of the Northern as well as of the Southern vote is committed against an abolition of slavery in a State; and Cuba must be acquired as a State, if acquired at all. The whole conservative body of the country would be resolutely and positively opposed to freeing the mass of negroes in that island, against the will of the people of the island, just exactly as they would be to freeing them in Louisiana itself. So I take it, that if, in future years, we should be driven upon the acquisition of further territory, the question will be settled as it was settled in 1850, and

that no power in this country can prevent its being so settled—if, indeed, it be adjusted at all. If you acquire territory free, it will remain free. If you acquire the island of Cuba, slavery will remain the law of the land until the inhabitants change it.

Gentlemen, we have in the threats against the Union, in the event of the election of one of the candidates, only another instance of that persistent agitation of the slavery question, and appealing to men's fears, and attempting to shake their nerves, which has been the policy, in my judgment, of the Democratic party, for a great many years past. Break up the Government! Why, gentlemen, who are going to do it? Mr. Douglas is not, for his whole charge against his Democratic opponent is, that he is a disunionist. Mr. BELL is not, because he is named as the Union candidate. Mr. Lincoln is not, because one of the grounds of charge against him is, that he says the South shall not secede if she wants to do so. [Laughter and applause.] Mr. Breckinridge disavows being a secessionist, and I believe him. The great body of his followers, I believe, disavow it likewise. I believe them. As to the remaining small body of noisy disunionists, I have no doubt there are such persons in the United States, but I think that now, as heretofore, in the event of no great grievance occurring, of no great outrage being perpetrated, of no war being made on the Southern States and their institutions; upon everything being allowed to continue as it has been hitherto, and to go on as it has proceeded heretofore; the sun being allowed to rise not covered with blood, and the moon being allowed to rise not turned to darkness—if these things shall continue, my impression is, that the hottest of the disunionists will count their numbers, and they will count the numbers on the other side, and they will prudently, upon a reconsideration of the whole matter, wait for a more convenient season. [Great laughter and applause.]

Then, gentlemen, is there anything to be afraid of? Are we surrounded with terrific forms and shapes, that haunt us as we pass along the streets, and make the merchant tremble for his ship upon the ocean, and the person holding stocks fear lest the stock board should show a decline in his favorite securities? Or are persons who want to speculate in property calculating the duration of the Union, to see whether land be worth a year's value in fee, or whether there will be so many people engaged in war that possibly rents will not be so high as they expected? Are these the considerations that we are now called upon to weigh? Are we on the borders of a civil war, or are we merely determining a question of political parties? If we are in the former, then, gentlemen, it requires very different methods from any that have been taken heretofore. It is not a New York or New Jersey contract for fusion that will avert that danger. Is there so near a prospect that the Union will be broken up, in the event of the triumph of Mr. Lincoln? Then, why do you not all turn in and vote for Mr. Breckinridge, who has the disunionists in his ranks—for they will be quiet if he be elected. Why does not Mr. Douglas cease his clamor about disunion, and get his friends to unite throughout the South, and likewise in the North, with his political opponents? Or, gentlemen, if we are not to be so generous as that, and can higgle over a matter of men, when the existence of the Government is at stake, as the Democrats say they are the only party competent to preserve the Union, and they are now in an unfortunate and distracted minority, why do they not bold out the olive branch to us, and say: "Know-Nothings as you are—enemies of civil and religious liberty, stained with midnight assassination—still, to save the Government, we will even vote for you?" [Great applause]

That would be a coalition equal to the occasion—as the alarmist and agitators state it. There would be a necessity which would justify it. That would be the subordination of every political division to the existence of the Government. But this puling question, "shall I join with you," "why then don't you join with me?" this miserable question as to who shall have the honor of saving the Government and who shall make the sacrifice, is unworthy of the crisis that disunionists and Union savers assert to be at hand, and which the latter profess to desire to avert. In my judgment, the Union receives more discredit from being saved all the time, than it would from being let alone to save itself. [Applause.] Thank Heaven, it is not a Maryland idea; we do not deal with politics in that way in Maryland; we do not make bargains with our political opponents, and lie down in the same bed, after they have spit at us, over us, for years. [Applause.] It is a New York idea, originating in local hostilities and interests—which has migrated into New Jersey, and tends to spread. It originated since the Baltimore Convention, since the nomination of Mr. BELL. "Oh! let us make a fusion to beat Mr. Lincoln"—not to elect Mr. BELL—observe the pharse, "to beat Mr. Lincoln," because all these evils will follow on his election! What good is that going to do Mr. BELL? ["That's it."] If there are these dangers, the men who cry out against them ought to be consistent in their proposals for fusion; it should be carried into every Northern State; Mr. Breckinridge, Mr. Douglas, and Mr. BELL, ought to unite there. Every gentleman in the South ought to be willing to abandon his political diversities of opinion with his neighbor, and sacrifice them on the altar of his country, if the *country* demand the sacrifice. For when the struggle is for life or death, for peace or civil war, it is out of place to allow political divisions of opinion to keep asunder lovers of the country. All parties should be merged in the presence of the overruling necessity of the country. And when gentlemen make an argument which should lead them to subordinate their individual opinions, and lay them down in that way in order to induce others to make political sacrifices, and yet show no desire themselves to make them, I say it is a cry of wolf, with no wolf threatening the fold at all. "Oh! fuse in New York and New Jersey, or Pennsylvania, for there they are

weak!" How about Georgia? What does Mr. Breckinridge say to that? How about Virginia? How about South Carolina? What of Alabama? What of Mississippi? There is no fusion there; it is war to the knife between the Union savers on both sides. [Laughter.] But up in one or two doubtful States in the North, where men are given to bargaining, and where political principles are only the counters laid down on the gambling board, there they can make bargains and fuse to save the Union [laughter] and their customers.

Gentlemen, I am disgusted at the suggestion, and I think the honorable gentlemen who have given it their assent will regret it when it is too late. I will do anything that is honorable to aid the election of JOHN BELL to the Presidency. [Great applause.] I will not give the lie to all political truth, by casting a vote or half a vote for men with whom I differ on every political question. [Continued applause.] In the presence of a common enemy, politics is silent; but as long as it is a question of politics, my duty requires me to vote for men in whom I have confidence personally, who I suppose will pursue those views of policy that I and my friends believe to be right, and to vote against all who are opposed to them. To that extent I will support JOHN BELL; but I will not vote for Mr. Douglas to defeat Mr. Lincoln, nor for any other purpose. [Renewed applause.]

Gentlemen, what good is fusion going to do Mr. BELL? If they really want to elect him, and not merely to frighten weak people into giving a Democrat a chance of being elected before the House of Representatives or before the Senate, they have a short way to do it. If the case is as grievous as they say, and they believe it, then it is to them a bagatelle whether Mr. Breckinridge or Mr. BELL be President; and if the Breckinridge men and Douglas men, throughout the whole body of the South, will, upon that one ground, (thus marking the earnestness of their belief, that the only way to avert revolution and disaster, and to keep their homes unsullied and free from the blood of their wives and children, is to defeat Mr. Lincoln, and elect somebody that is safer and better,) vote for JOHN BELL, it would be something that I could appreciate. They can mark that feeling in a manner which will speak in tones of thunder to every man of common sense north of Mason and Dixon's line; they can do it by just casting their votes for JOHN BELL, and by making the avowal that he shall be President if their united votes can make him so. And they can say, that if they fail there, then if Mr. Lane does not come before the Senate, but Mr. EVERETT does, they, the Democrats, will vote Mr. EVERETT into the Presidential chair. [Great applause.] Let them say it, and we shall begin to believe that they are in earnest.

New York politicians are very well content, as they say, to defeat Mr. Lincoln, and let a Democrat be elected. They are not proposing to aid Mr. BELL, nor can it. It only humbles his party; it deprives it of power in the future; it almost puts an end to the possibility of its ever being powerful in a State where it has been made a subject of barter and sale upon 'change. Who can fling back a Democrat's charge of bargain and corruption? Who hereafter can ever cast in the teeth of the Democrats their covering up their divisions by compromises? What becomes of the perpetual assault upon them, that in the South they have one opinion, and in the North another; that in the South they are extreme slavery men, and in the North have free-soilers in their ranks, who receive their highest honors? Who hereafter can ever cast the imputation on them, that the Kansas-Nebraska act was supported with one signification in the North and another in the South? Are not the mouths of those who, differing from Mr. Douglas and Mr. Breckinridge on these very points, yet agree to give Mr. Douglas say twenty-five votes, in order that they may buy ten votes for Mr. BELL—are not their mouths sealed forever?

Let us work it out, gentlemen, in a national point of view. Is it wise thus to act? Where does it send the election? If successful, it sends it to the House of Representatives. There was a time—I hope it has not passed, but I fear that the course of policy which has been pursued by a portion of Mr. BELL's friends has rendered it now almost impossible—there was a time when, had the election failed out of doors, and Mr. Lincoln been defeated, Mr. BELL would have gotten, in my judgment, and gotten cheerfully, the vote of every Republican State in the lower House. The insane method of assault upon and misrepresentation of Mr. Lincoln's opinions, of the purposes of his party, have, I fear, put an end to the possibility of a single vote from that quarter, if the election should go to the House of Representatives. In my judgment, it will be an impossibility to elect anybody there, such is the division of parties. The Republicans have not a majority; the Democrats have not a majority; the Americans have not a majority.

The Republicans and the People's party have fifteen States. Possibly they might buy two, under the enormous pressure of the occasion. [Laughter.] The Democrats have enough to elect, if they can get all the American States, together with Oregon and California, which now belong to them in the House. Whether they will go that way or not, it is not my province here to say; but it is perfectly certain that the Democratic States will not go for Mr. BELL. Does anybody think they will? Look at the Speaker's election. Do not forget things that have occurred within a few months past. Go and examine that list, and tell me whether there is a single Democratic State that, under these circumstances, will cast its vote in the House for JOHN BELL. Then there is no election, and this accompanied, probably, with such scenes of violence and tumult as possibly men of greater firmness than I have may desire to encounter, but from which I pray to be delivered. I have gone through two contests in the House of Representatives for the election of the comparatively unimportant office of Speaker, with the House divided as it is divided now. I have seen these scenes of violence; I have heard words of menace; I have looked from day to day to some out-

break that would drench that hall in blood, and be the beginning of a real (and not a newspaper) revolution in the country; but, by the infinite blessing of Providence, that danger has been averted. I will not rush upon the bosses of His buckler, and tempt Him too far. I will not try that House of Representatives again to do the business which the *people* ought to do, in their majesty and in their calmness. [Applause.] I will not tempt them with the immense bribes that can be urged, with the intensity of political passions excited to the uttermost, with the fierceness of men, some of them, possibly, only too willing to convert a political into a revolutionary strife in that Hall. I do not wish to see the immense temptations of a Presidential election forced on the House of Representatives without a necessity, and only in the last resort—something to be shunned, and not to be sought for—something to be trembled over whenever it comes—something to be thankful to God for, if it shall pass without civil violence.

And what next? If there be no election by the House when the 4th of March comes, who is the President? The Vice President, elected by the Senate. Who are in the Senate? A clear Democratic majority. If Mr. Lane's name goes to the Senate, of course he will be by them cheerfully elected President. But suppose Mr. EVERETT'S name goes to the Senate? Oh, say the confiding New Yorkers, he will be elected by the Democratic Senators. Well, gentlemen, I should go for credulity somewhere else than the stock exchange. Expect them to elect EDWARD EVERETT! Why, gentlemen, they have the game in their own hands. I do not expect so much from their liberality. I should rejoice in such a result. Nothing, after the terrific scenes in the lower House, could give this country such peace and quiet and relief as to know that, when the wished-for 4th of March shall come, such a man as EDWARD EVERETT will be in the Presidency, no matter by whom or how chosen. [Applause.] But I have not that faith in the Democratic Senators, and I am not sure they would make an election in the Senate, if his name and Mr. Hamlin's should be alone before them.

I think they might prefer rather to wait until the fourth of March, let the Presidential office be vacant, have a year of interregnum, and a new election, in the midst of which, without a head to the Government, who will tell me what would occur? Or, they might take the other alternative, doubtful in law, but which they may undertake to solve, and therefore may solve to suit themselves; and, instead of having an interregnum, Mr. Breckinridge being then a member of the Senate, they may elect him President of that body, and treat him as President of the United States after the fourth of March. The Constitution of the United States appears to have left a very unfortunate, it may prove some day a very dangerous gap. It is possible that a construction may close that gap, but none has closed it yet. It declares, in the event of the death, resignation, or disability, of the President and Vice President happening after entrance into office, Congress may declare what officer shall discharge the duties of President, till removal of the disability, or an election.

Congress has provided that the President of the Senate becomes, for the time being, the President, and in his absence the Speaker of the House of Representatives becomes the President. But there seems to be no provision for a *failure to elect* both President and Vice President. The Constitution—and the law which was intended to provide for the vacancy of the Presidency follows the language of the Constitution—does not authorize Congress to provide for that case. There seems to be no provision anywhere for the case of the Presidential office being absolutely vacant at the commencement of a term—the case of an absolute failure to elect either a President or Vice President. Whether, in that contingency, the President *pro tempore* of the Senate would assume to exercise the powers of President of the United States, or whether it would be treated by the Senate (the only legal body existing on the fourth of March) as vacant, no mind can now determine; and legal arguments may possibly be adduced on both sides. We may very well rest assured that the majority of the Senate will settle it in whichever way will best suit their interests. It rests with them; it rests with no one else; you and I have no power over it. When the matter goes to the Senate, if they see fit to make no election, we are pushed upon this dangerous alternative, a vacant or a disputed Presidency.

If the people wish to run afoul of these difficulties, well and good. They were not originally intended to be made by bargaining politicians. The provision of the Constitution is for a case of accident or failure, after a *bona fide* effort of the people to elect, not for a conspiracy of a few politicians in a corner, in one State of the United States, to adjourn their political difficulties, and their personal hatreds, into the Halls of Congress. I therefore enter my protest solemnly against any such style of electioneering. Others may engage in it. In the State of New York, it is none of my business. I am not called upon to vote for Mr. Douglas or Mr. Breckinridge, and I have nothing more to say about it, except that it is with them; but it is not our style, here in Maryland, of standing to our principles, and conducting our canvass, and doing our best to elect our own candidates. [Great applause.]

What I have said, gentlemen, covers the exposition I desired to make to you this evening. I am aware that there is a great cry about sectionalism, and a great scramble for the vacant title of National. I wish, gentlemen, that there were a National candidate for the Presidency. I wish there were a really National party—not merely one which has principles that will suit the whole land, but one whose power extended unbroken from North to South, as did the Whig party, in its days of glory. [Applause.] I trust that, ere I die, I shall again see the lines of these divisions obliterated. But when people talk about sectionalism, and one party casts upon another the imputation of being sectional, I am free for my part to say, that they are all sectional, in any proper sense. Mr. Douglas—is he a Nation-

al candidate? He is, it would seem, the regular nominee of the Democratic party; but the Democratic party is not the nation; for the regular Democratic party is as much a whole party, as a man is whole when cloven by a sabre from head to heels. Where is his strength? In the North! He has a few supporters in the South, it is true. Mr. Breckinridge—is he a National candidate? He has a great strength in the South. Whether it will be as powerful there as he supposes, remains to be seen. Circumstances now indicate that somebody else will have a say, in political matters, in the South, besides the Democrats, hereafter; but his strength is in the South. In the North, it is the shrunk shank of a decrepid old man. Mr. Lincoln's strength is undoubtedly in the North; he has supporters in some of the border slave States. Is not Mr BELL'S strength in the South, although he has supporters sporadically over the whole North?

Gentlemen, it is the misery of our condition, that turn wherever we may, we find that this infernal strife has split everybody into a thousand pieces; and no man can tell where to find the piece that belongs to him. [Laughter.] Nay, more, gentlemen, if I may be allowed to quote words which I heard in a sacred place, from a very eloquent gentleman, (Rev. Mr. Stockton,) whom, doubtless, many of you have heard in the pulpit here in Baltimore, I say of the condition of the people of this country and its party, especially of that great Opposition party to the Democrats which now is rent into fragments and struggling together, as he said of the Christian religion—that the vase in which the precious spirit of Christianity was held had been broken by sectarian strife into so many pieces, that not only was its beauty marred and gone, and its precious essence poured out and lost, but that he who on a mission of love attempted to collect its fragments, and put them together, was in danger, in the attempt to reconstruct the vase, of cutting his fingers. It is the danger—it is the sickness of the times: and, instead of attempting to cure it, men who ought to know better are acting so as to aggravate it. The patient is in a fever, and they wrap him up in blankets. His blood is boiling, and they dose him with strong drinks and fire-water, and call that—curing!

Gentlemen, there is a degree of timidity that is, of all things, in my judgment, the most dangerous in political life. Half the blood that was shed in the French Revolution was shed from sheer terror. It was not courage, it was not ferocity, it was sheer terror, that made them cut their neighbors' throats to-day, lest those neighbors should cut theirs to-morrow. That is the state of mind in which the conduct of too many in this canvass tends to throw the people of the United States. I lift my voice against it.

Whether these sentiments are popular here or not, is to me a matter of secondary moment. I have a duty to perform to myself, as well as to you. I agree with that most honorable and distinguished gentleman, my friend, Mr. Millson, of Norfolk, who, in his late letter, said, if I am not mistaken, that he thought it is duty to warn his constituents, as well when there *was* danger of invasion of their rights as when, in point of fact, there was *none*. And, acting upon that high principle, I say here now, this night, that peace is within our grasp, if we only see fit to hold fast to it. If we choose to encourage war, we may encourage it too far.

Gentlemen, there has been a sort of hesitation on the part of the opponents of the Democratic party to meet them directly in the eye, to make formally the issue with them as to the correctness and safety of their principles and policy, and their mode of conducting the Government. And the reason the Opposition have failed in other parts of the South is, in my judgment, because they have *not* met the Democrats in that way; the reason that we have not failed in Maryland is because we have not been afraid to strike a blow that would overthrow our enemy. [Applause.] It only requires that there should be energy and union, and the day is ours.

Gibbon tells us that as Christianity progressed and spread as far as Egypt, the idols roused the ire of the faithful. There was at Alexandria an image of Serapis, which superstitious faith in ancient prophecies protected from their iconoclastic rage.

"It was confidently affirmed that if any impious hand should dare to violate the majesty of the spot, the heavens and the earth would instantly return to their original chaos. An intrepid soldier, animated by zeal, and armed with a mighty battle axe, ascended the ladder; and even the Christian multitude expected with some anxiety the event of the combat. He aimed a vigorous stroke against the cheek of Serapis; the cheek fell to the ground; the thunder was silent; and both the heavens and the earth continued to preserve their accustomed order and tranquility. The victorious soldier repeated his blows; the huge idol was overthrown and broken in pieces; and the limbs of Serapis were ignominiously dragged through the streets of Alexandria. His mangled carcass was burnt in the amphitheatre, amidst the shouts of the populace; and many persons attribute their conversion to the discovery of the impotence of their tutelar deity."

Gentlemen, smite fearlessly the Democratic party! The Union will survive its fragments. [Enthusiastic applause.]